

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 13-24, 26-30, 33-38 and 40-46 are in this application and are presented for consideration.

The claims, specification and drawings have been amended to place the application in better form. In particular figure 10 has been added to show the embodiment with a plurality of LED chips on a base, and the specification has been amended to correspond to the new figure 10. This has been done to address the objection with regard to claim 19. Claim 46 has also been canceled in order to overcome the objection with regard to the two plates directly holding the LED chip.

The office action indicates that applicant failed to disclose a reference as required by 37 CFR 1.98. In particular, that applicant's figures 3A and 3B are substantially identical to figure 7 and 8 in prior art reference US 6,299,332. Applicant did not disclose reference 332, because the features in figures 3A and 3B, namely the enveloping plates, are well known and very popular. Figures 3A and 3B only show a generic example of the LED device of the present invention in a typical application. The envelopes 51, 52 shown in Fig.3A and 3B are only one example, and the enveloping plates can be changed to other shapes. Since the enveloping plates are so well known, and the specific shape was not important, applicant felt that a common example of an enveloping plate could be used, and that such was within the common knowledge in the art so that applicant was not obliged to produce the origin of figures 3A and 3B.

If the patent office desires, figures 3A and 3B can be amended to have a different shape in order to not be identical with 332.

The office action also indicates that applicant should identify the origin of applicant's other drawings and all other art related to applicant's invention, applicant's disclosure, the claimed subject matter, etc.. Applicant is unsure of the amount of detail the office action requires. Does the office action require the identity of the origin of each different type of lighting device, such as an incandescent bulb, and LED? Furthermore, should applicant provide the identity of the origin of the wires and lighting strings?

Independent claim 47 has been rejected as being obvious over Huang '332 in view of Brunner '554 and Urban '515.

Claim 47 sets forth that the protective device directly holds all of the elements subsequently listed, namely the LED light bulb, the electrical connecting portion and a bent insulator portion. In the embodiment of the drawings, the protective device is shown by reference 5, and the electrical connecting portion by reference 20. Applicant finds no teaching nor suggestion of any structure in the prior art which "directly" holds all of these structures. The rejection equates the protective device with the body of the light between the bulb 2 and the wires 21 of 332. Applicant has reviewed this structure in 332, and finds no indication that this structure directly connects to a connecting portion. The connecting portion has been previously set forth as being a structure where each of the conductors of the insulated wires is connected to one of the lead frames. The rejection does not specifically indicate which portion of 332 is equated with the connection portion of the present invention. Applicant has reviewed 332 and finds no teaching nor suggestion of such a connecting portion. It appears that 332 is silent with regard to how conductors of an insulated wire connect to lead frames of an LED,

or other light generator. Since 332 does not describe a connecting portion, it is understandable that 332 therefore cannot describe a protective device directly connected to such a connecting portion. 332 therefore does not anticipate the protective device of claim 47, and claim 47 therefore defines over the rejection.

The rejection also uses 515 to describe securing a wire within an aperture by a “bunny ear”. The rejection appears to state that it would be obvious to modify 332 by using the bunny ear of 515 to prevent a wire from pulling through an aperture. Applicant notes that 515 indicates that the “bunny year” is not a workable solution, column 1 lines 50 through 59. Therefore the combination of 515 and 332 would actually lead a person away from the use of a bunny ear. The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is therefore not found in the prior art. Since the suggestion or motivation to combine must be found in the prior art or general knowledge, the present rejection is untenable.

Even if a person of ordinary skill was to go against the disadvantages of the bunny ear, applicant notes that there is no aperture in 332 in which the bunny ear could be used in. The rejection does not indicate where in 332 is defined the aperture that would cooperate with the bunny ear. The rejection therefore appears to propose a hypothetical combination to nonexisting parts. Claim 47 therefore further defines over the obviousness rejection.

Independent claim 41 does not appear to be specifically rejected in the office action. The detailed portion of the office action does not indicate that claim 41, and its dependent claims, are rejected. However, there is no indication that these claims are allowed. Applicant notes that independent claim 41 sets forth separating an end of the insulated wires into at least

two plates to expose the conductor. This does not appear to be present in 332. Also, as applicant as described above, it would not be obvious to use the bunny ears of 515 in 332, because 515 indicates that bunny ears are disadvantageous. Furthermore, applicant notes that 555 indicates using bunny ears for preventing a wire from pulling through an aperture. However claim 41 does not describe an aperture and there is no indication in 332 how any aperture would relate to the present invention.

Independent claims 1, and 44 have also been rejected as being obvious over Huang ‘332 in view of Brunner ‘554 and Urban ‘515.

These claims also set forth the protective device directly holding the connecting portion, and that the connecting portion is a structure where the conductor of the wire is connected to one of the lead frames. As described above, 332 does not describe this connecting portion, and therefore cannot describe a protective device directly holding such a connecting portion. These independent claims therefore also define over the combination of applied prior art.

The rejection of these independent claims also uses 515 to describe bending an insulating portion away from a conductor. The rejection also states that would be obvious to modify 332 with the bending of an insulating portion to prevent a wire from pulling through an aperture. As described above, the rejection does not indicate where the aperture is in 332, or how that aperture relates to the structure of the present claims. Therefore the combination of the prior art in the rejection of these claims is also untenable.

New claims 48 through 56 set forth further features of the connection between the lead frames, wires and protective device. As described above, the prior art does not describe a

connecting portion between frames and wires, and therefore the prior art can further not describe these additional features in claims 48 through 56. These claims therefore further define over the prior art.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions which would further favorable prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's representative by telephone to discuss possible changes.

At this time applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application, and based on the above amendments and remarks, respectfully solicits allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted
for Applicant,



By: _____
Theobald Dengler
Registration No. 34,575
McGLEW AND TUTTLE, P.C.

TD:tf
71206-11

Attached: (1) Sheet of New Drawings
Petition for One Month Extension of Time

DATED: October 12, 2006
BOX 9227 SCARBOROUGH STATION
SCARBOROUGH, NEW YORK 10510-9227
(914) 941-5600

SHOULD ANY OTHER FEE BE REQUIRED, THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE IS HEREBY REQUESTED TO CHARGE SUCH FEE TO OUR DEPOSIT ACCOUNT 13-0410.